Ontario Review Board

Annual Report

Fiscal Reporting Period April 1, 2013- March 31, 2014

Ontario

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Message from the Chair 2

Overview of the Ontario Review Board 3

Jurisdiction of the Ontario Review Board 4

Organization of the Ontario Review Board 5

Increasing Complexity of Board Hearings 6

Performance Measures and Targets 7

By Way of Summary 11

Members of the Board 12

Review Board Personnel 16

Financial Information 17

Ontario Review Board
Office of the Honourable
Mr. Justice Richard D. Schneider

151 Bloor Street West, 10th Floor
Toronto ON M5S 2T5
Telephone: (416) 327-8866
Facsimile: (416) 327-8867

Ontario

Message from the Chair

Once again, this past year has brought to the Ontario Review Board a record number of hearings regarding individuals with verdicts of either Unfit to Stand Trial or Not Criminally Responsible on account of mental disorder. This is so even though the actual number of newly accused subject to our jurisdiction is slightly lower than the previous year. Our data confirm that mentally ill individuals becoming involved with the criminal justice system remains a significant concern.

At the same time we are aware of the efforts being made with innovative programs to 'divert' many of these people out of the courts and Review Board systems earlier in the process. I am of the view that these efforts have great potential. In particular, there is the work of the various Mental Health Courts, the Ministry of the Attorney General's 'Diversion of Mentally Disordered Accused', and various 'pre-arrest' diversion schemes which are proving to be very effective.

As I am at the two year mark as Chair of the ORB we have made considerable progress and have identified three key target objectives:

1. Reduction in hearing times through more extensive pre-hearing conferencing,
2. Reduction in the time from hearing to the production of our Reasons (with 4 weeks being the goal),
3. Reduction in the number of adjourned hearings, accomplished through:
   i. More extensive pre-hearing conferencing, and
   ii. Scheduling of hearings 9 months in advance (so as to avoid parties' 'conflicts')

Meanwhile, the Review Board continues to fulfill its statutory mandate as set out in Part XX.1 of the *Criminal Code of Canada*, complemented by its strong membership and supported by a very effective administrative office. All are dedicated to conducting efficient hearings all within the legislated time lines.



The Honourable Mr. Justice Richard D. Schneider

The Ontario Review Board is a unique tribunal that, with its counterparts, forms a critical component of the Canadian justice system. While it operates within the province of Ontario, the Ontario Review Board is not governed by provincial legislation, but by federal legislation.

Established under Part XX.1 of the *Criminal Code*, the role of the Ontario Review Board is clearly defined as follows:

> *"A Review Board shall be established or designated for each province to make or review dispositions concerning any accused in respect of whom a verdict of not criminally responsible by reason of mental disorder or unfit to stand trial is rendered, and shall consist of not fewer than five members appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council of the province..."(Part XX.1)*

While the role of each Review Board is the same from province to province, the *Criminal Code* states that "a Review Board shall be treated as having been established under the laws of the province." This statement recognizes the fact that the efficiency and effectiveness of each Board in each province hinges on its connection to the province's psychiatric facilities and mental health delivery system.

The Ontario Review Board's procedures are directed solely by the *Criminal Code* and the *Public Inquiries Act*. Unlike adjudicative agencies that are created by provincial statute, the Ontario Review Board is not subject to the provisions of the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act*. Appeals from decisions of the Ontario Review Board are made to the Court of Appeal for Ontario.

The Ontario Review Board has jurisdiction over individuals, referred to in the *Criminal Code* as "accused," who the Ontario courts have found to be either unfit to stand trial (unfit), or not criminally responsible (NCR) on account of mental disorder for the commission of a criminal offence.

Individuals found to be unfit to stand trial continue to be subject to the jurisdiction of the Ontario Review Board until it finds them fit to stand trial. At that time, they are returned to the court and if the court confirms that verdict, their cases proceed in the normal course.

In dealing with accused found not criminally responsible on account of mental disorder, the Ontario Review Board's responsibility is to hold a hearing and to make a disposition for each accused under its jurisdiction, taking into consideration the "*need to protect the public from dangerous persons, the mental condition of the accused, the reintegration of the accused into society and the other needs of the accused.*"

These complex factors must be considered at each hearing conducted by the Ontario Review Board. They affect both the liberty of individuals and the safety of the public. The importance of the Ontario Review Board's decisions as they relate to these basic human rights is further underlined by the fact that appeals from the Ontario Review Board's decisions are made directly to the Court of Appeal for Ontario.

Decisions of the Ontario Review Board are referred to as dispositions. Following a hearing, the Ontario Review Board renders one of three dispositions:

1) An absolute discharge
2) A discharge subject to conditions; or
3) Detention in a hospital, subject to conditions.

For those detained in hospital, the Ontario Review Board issues a warrant for detention as set out in the *Criminal Code*.

Other than absolute discharges, dispositions of the Ontario Review Board are to be reviewed by the Ontario Review Board at least once every twelve months.

Parties to a hearing typically include the accused, the person in charge of the hospital in which the accused is or may be detained or to which the accused reports, and a representative of the Attorney General. Other persons who have a substantial interest in protecting the interests of the accused may be made a party if the Ontario Review Board is of the opinion that it is just to designate such persons as parties.

In carrying out its mandate as directed by the *Criminal Code*, the Ontario Review Board operates in a fashion similar to the courts.

As of March 31, 2014, the Ontario Review Board had 155 members. In addition to a full time Chair, the Ontario Review Board's part time members include 38 alternate chairs, 13 legal members, 59 psychiatrists, 18 psychologists, and 26 public members. All are residents of Ontario. The members of the Ontario Review Board are appointed by Order-in-Council.

Board Composition

The *Criminal Code* stipulates that the Chairperson must be a judge of the Federal Court or of a provincial superior, district or county court, or a person who has retired from or is entitled to be appointed to such a judicial office. "Chairperson" by definition includes not only the Chairperson as appointed by the provincial Cabinet, but also any other qualified member whom the Chairperson designates as an "alternate chairperson" to act on the Chairperson's behalf. In Ontario, the Chair usually appoints alternate chairs who are lawyers with 10 years experience, judges or retired judges.

The *Criminal Code* also specifies that a quorum for a hearing consists of three Ontario Review Board members. Each panel must have a Chairperson or alternate chairperson, a psychiatrist and any other member. The Ontario Review Board usually sits in panels of five consisting of the Chair or alternate chair, two psychiatrists, or one psychiatrist and one psychologist, a legal member and a public member.

Board Hearings

An initial hearing, held after an individual has been found unfit to stand trial or not criminally responsible on account of mental disorder for the commission of a criminal offence in court, is usually conducted in the hospital where the accused is detained or directed to attend, or in a court house. The Ontario Review Board no longer holds hearings in jails or detention centres. The Ontario Review Board is required by statute to hold an initial hearing within 45 or 90 days following the verdict of the court.

An annual hearing is required for those accused who are already subject to the Ontario Review Board's jurisdiction. Annual reviews are conducted in the provincially-designated psychiatric facility where the accused is detained or reporting, in a courtroom, or in other meeting rooms open to the public.

Those who are declared to be unfit to stand trial must be represented by counsel at hearings conducted by the Ontario Review Board, and most accused persons found not criminally responsible on account of mental disorder for the commission of a criminal offence are also represented by counsel. At each hearing, evidence from the hospital where the accused is detained or to which an accused is required to report is considered along with other evidence which may be adduced. Following deliberation by the panel who has conducted the hearing, a written disposition and the written reasons for that disposition are issued.

We have been able to attenuate considerably the trend toward longer and more complex hearings which we had been experiencing over the past several years. While our hearings are complex, especially with our '*Charter* competence' confirmed by the Supreme Court in *R. v. Conway*, most of our hearings are now completed within the allotted time slot. This has been accomplished over the last year through more effective use of pre-hearing conferences which serve to obviate much of what might otherwise have been litigated. It remains the case that most parties to the Board's hearings are represented by counsel.

Continued guidance from the Court of Appeal assists the Board in providing fair hearings to the people under its jurisdiction. Appellate decisions in the past fiscal year reiterated the obligation of the Board to convene timely hearings, especially where restrictions of liberty have resulted. Appellate decisions both articulate the expectations of the court and clarify the Board's statutory mandate, however they can increase the obligations upon the Board's operation.

Since the amendments to the *Criminal Code* in 2006, and continuing to date, more administrative time is required to meet the Board's responsibility to victims, and to provide them with information about the Board. The Board's data-base of notified victims now surpasses the number of accused persons under the Board's jurisdiction. Should Bill C-54 be proclaimed in full our obligations in this regard will add considerably to the time required to manage our case load. The Board will now be required to notify victims whenever an accused is either absolutely or conditionally discharged, every time the Board sends a High Risk Accused ('HRA') to court for review and every time the Board receives a new accused with a verdict of NCR. The Board must also ensure hearings are adjourned at any of the junctures to permit the victim time to file statements.

New Accused (NCR and Unfit)



Figure 1 - Number of New Accused per Year

2013/14	189
2012/13	231
2011/12	251
2010/11	248
2009/10	275
2008/09	255
2007/08	318
2006/08	311
2005/06	269
2004/05	193
2003/04	148
2002/03	208
2001/02	179
2000/01	219
1999/00	200
1998/99	252
1997/98	196
1996/97	239
1995/96	222
1994/95	219
1993/94	210
1992/93	198
1991/92	80
1990/91	72
1989/90	82
1988/89	94
1987/88	73

Performance Measures and Targets

The core business of the Ontario Review Board is to conduct hearings and issue dispositions in accordance with the *Criminal Code* within the mandatory timeframes - 45 or 90 days after the verdict is rendered, and at least annually thereafter.

During the fiscal year 2013-2014 the courts found 61 accused to be unfit to stand trial and 128 not criminally responsible on account of mental disorder for the commission of a criminal offence for a total of 189 new accused coming under the jurisdiction of the Board (see Figure 1).

The ongoing influx of new accused continues to have a significant financial impact on the Ontario Review Board. The initial hearings for these new accused are more expensive to convene as they must be scheduled on an ad hoc basis and typically require more travel and accommodation. The hearings are held where the accused is being detained or resides. These matters are usually heard singly rather than organized with a group of other cases as are the annual hearings because they need to be conducted within 45 days of the court verdict. There are often adjournments when insufficient information is available as to the mental condition of the accused or what, if any, threat the accused poses to the safety of the public. In fact, amendments to the Criminal Code that came into force on June 30, 2006 attempted to address this potential lack of information and there are now provisions in the Criminal Code that allow a Review Board to order an assessment of the accused, if such evidence is necessary to make a disposition.



2013/14	2222
2012/13	2012
2011/12	2004
2010/11	1972
2009/10	1920
2008/09	1775
2007/08	1805
2006/07	1534
2005/06	1430
2004/05	1319
2003/04	1282
2002/03	1233
2001/02	1283
2000/01	1280
1999/00	1248
1998/99	1065
1997/98	920
1996/97	872
1995/96	753
1994/95	694
1993/94	668
1992/93	670
1991/92	415
1990/91	413
1989/90	482
1988/89	440
1987/88	410

Figure 2 - Number of Hearings per Year

After making a disposition, the Ontario Review Board must review that disposition within 12 months and every 12 months thereafter until such time as the Board cannot conclude that the accused remains a significant threat to the safety of the public.

In addition to initial hearings and annual hearings, the *Criminal Code* provides for a discretionary early review of a disposition at the request of any party. An early review is mandatory if requested by the hospital or if an individual's liberties are restricted for more than seven days. The total number of all hearings conducted by the Board in 2013-2014 was 2222 (see Figure 2).



2013/14	129
2012/13	114
2011/12	112
2010/11	94
2009/10	105
2008/09	90
2007/08	88
2006/07	76
2005/06	131
2004/05	129
2003/04	135
2002/03	102
2001/02	96
2000/01	134
1999/00	111
1998/99	42
1997/98	40
1996/97	38
1995/96	39
1994/95	24
1993/94	31
1992/93	46
1991/92	36
1990/91	36
1989/90	25
1988/89	21
1987/88	20

Figure 3 – Absolute Discharges per Year

Accused persons that are not criminally responsible or under the former term, not guilty by reason of insanity (NGRI), remain under the jurisdiction of the Ontario Review Board until such time as they are granted an absolute discharge by the Board. In 1999 the Supreme Court decision in *Winko* clarified the test for an absolute discharge, and the Ontario Review Board experienced a significant increase in the number of absolute discharges it granted (see Figure 3).

Those found Unfit to Stand Trial remain under the jurisdiction of the Board until such time as the court either finds the accused fit to stand trial or until the court grants a stay (if it finds the unfit accused both permanently unfit and not a significant threat to the safety of the public).

Number of Accused Under Board's Jurisdiction



2013/14	1603
2012/13	1644
2011/12	1617
2010/11	1622
2009/10	1527
2008/09	1419
2007/08	1330
2006/07	1241
2005/06	1044
2004/05	995
2003/04	983
2002/03	991
2001/02	1086
2000/01	1055
1999/00	913
1998/99	824
1997/98	754
1996/97	656
1995/96	662
1994/95	550
1993/94	465
1992/93	426
1991/92	391
1990/91	390
1989/90	409
1988/89	416
1987/88	386

Figure 4 – Number of Accused per Year

As a result of *Winko*, the Ontario Review Board experienced more equilibrium between the number of accused entering the system, and those exiting via absolute discharge, although the Board continues to see an annual increase in the total number of accused persons under its supervision in recent years.

Variables such as amendments to the Criminal Code, court decisions, intake hearing fluctuations, and rate of discharge dictate the Ontario Review Board's workload, which can fluctuate dramatically from month to month. The Ontario Review Board overall meets its demanding schedule and delivers quality service.

Occasionally the Board exceeds the deadline for a hearing, but this represents a small percentage of overall scheduled hearings. Reasons for an adjourned hearing include:

- Adjournment at the request of a party;
- Adjournment to obtain evidence or an assessment;
- Failure of the Board to be notified of new accused;
- Clerical error.

The Ontario Review Board continues to pursue methods of increasing the efficiency of its operations and processes, and the delivery of a high quality of service.

By Way of Summary

As can be seen from the number of hearings conducted during the 2013-2014 year, the Ontario Review Board is continually challenged to provide hearings in accordance with the legislated timelines while also providing a high quality of service.

Each year the Board is able to achieve these timelines in the vast majority of cases, as we did in 2013-2014, while integrating a significant number of new accused persons into the existing work load.

Pre-Hearing Conferences

In recognizing that with the increasing complexity of hearings comes increased costs, we have implemented a pre-hearing conference process for any case that is identified by the Board or any party as requiring more than 1.5 hours of hearing time. This process has allowed the Board over the past year to best maximize the time allotted for annual review hearings. An experienced alternate chair is assigned to meet with all counsel to rationalize time requirements, and to define the issues in order to improve the hearing process. Pre-hearing conferences ensure that we act in a proactive manner to identify and narrow issues, and to allot appropriate resources to cases that have greater complexity. In 2013-2014 the Board conducted 59 pre-hearing conferences.

Education and Communication

In keeping with our commitment to provide a high quality of service and expertise for the community and the accused persons who come before the Board, we have remained vigilant in communicating changes in the law and forensic psychiatry/psychology to all members throughout the year. These are often distributed in memorandums, or meetings with alternate chairs and legal members. As well our yearly education seminars tackle topical issues in the forensic field and are directed to better inform our members with the most up to date evidence and practices concerning forensic patients.

Finally, we communicate with courts and consult on issues that may arise at the time that an accused person is found NCR or unfit, and maintain an ongoing dialogue with the Courts to enhance the timeliness and quality of service provided to the community and the accused persons who come within our jurisdiction.

The Board is thankful for the cooperation we receive from the Courts and the Ministry in helping us achieve these goals. We look forward to reporting on more achievements next year.

Members of the Board

Member	Date First Appointed	Date Current Term Expires
Chair		
The Honourable Mr. Justice R. D. Schneider	June 27, 2012	June 12, 2017
Alternate Chairs (& Legal Members)		
Mr. P. Band	March 24, 2010	March 23, 2015
Ms. L. Banks	October 20, 2010	October 19, 2015
Dr. H. Bloom	January 25, 1990	September 30, 2017
Mr. R. J. Braudo	August 21, 2001	August 20, 2013
The Honourable J. W. Brooke, Q.C. *	December 8, 1999	December 7, 2014
Ms. J.J.D. Burnside *	May 4, 2005	May 3, 2016
Ms. Kathryn Chalmers	October 20, 2010	October 19, 2015
Ms. K. Chown	April 8, 2009	April 7, 2014
Mr. R.G. Coates	February 7, 2007	February 6, 2017
Mr. W.B. Donaldson	June 25, 2003	June 24, 2014
The Honourable W.R. Dupont, Q.C. *	December 2, 1999	December 16, 2013
Ms. M. A. Finkelstein	January 5, 2006	January 4, 2014
Ms. C. Fromstein	August 25, 2004	August 24, 2017
Mr. J. Goldenberg	November 3, 2004	November 6, 2017
The Honourable G. Y. Goulard, Q.C.	June 30, 2000	June 21, 2014
The Honourable J.D. Greco	December 4, 2002	February 14, 2014
Ms. R. Grinberg	April 11, 2006	April 10, 2014
Mr. J. Holding, Q.C.	July 5, 2007	July 22, 2016
Ms. S. Kert *	April 29, 1999	April 28, 2018
The Honourable J.M. Labrosse	May 14, 1997	May 13, 2014
Ms Michele Labrosse	November 3, 2009	November 24, 2014
Ms. S.E. Lavine *	December 4, 2002	December 3, 2016
Ms. J.A. Leiper *	April 2, 2008	April 1, 2018
Mr. C. Lewis, Q.C.	June 1, 2005	May 31, 2013
Mr. R. Linton	June 27, 2007	June 26, 2016
The Honourable H.R. Locke	October 21, 1998	November 6, 2014
Ms. C. MacDonald *	March 25, 2009	March 24, 2019
Mr. C.M. MacIntyre, Q.C. *	February 18, 2004	February 17, 2016
Mr. T.J. Madison	June 20, 2007	June 19, 2016
The Honourable Mr. Justice D.J. McCombs	February 27, 2008	February 26, 2018
The Honourable N.D. McRae, Q.C.*	August 8, 2005	August 7, 2013
Ms. W. Miller	September 30, 2009	September 29, 2014
Ms. J. Munn	April 8, 2009	April 7, 2014
Mr. J. A. Neuberger *	June 19, 2002	February 20, 2016
The Honourable J.G.J. O'Driscoll	November 29, 2006	November 28, 2016
Ms. M.S.G. Peeris	February 6, 2002	March 22, 2016
Ms. E.J. Polak	June 17, 2009	June 16, 2014
The Honourable Mr. Justice J.C.L. Scime *	January 5, 2006	January 4, 2016
Ms. L. Stam	May 6, 2009	May 5, 2014

* Under O. Reg 88/11 of the *Adjudicative Tribunal Accountability, Governance and Appointments Act*, members were reappointed using an Automatic Waiver Form.

Member	Date First Appointed	Date Current Term Expires
Mr. R. Steinberg *	July 15, 2005	July 14, 2016
Ms. L. Stoyka *	March 25, 2009	March 24, 2019
Ms. F. Yaskiel	April 11, 2006	April 10, 2014
Legal Members		
The Honourable R. Armstrong	May 29, 2013	May 28, 2013
Mr. G. Beasley *	January 9, 2013	January 8 ,2018
Mr. A. Cader	April 18, 2011	April 17, 2016
Ms. J. Cameron *	January 9, 2013	January 8, 2018
The Honourable J.D Carnwath, Q.C	February 18, 2009	February 17, 2014
The Honourable Frank Caputo	November 17, 2010	November 16, 2013
The Honourable Mr. Justice R. DelFrate	January 13, 2010	January 12, 2015
Mr. H. Dhillon *	November 5, 2008	November 4, 2018
The Honourable Madam Justice T. Dunnet	February 17, 2010	February 16, 2015
The Honourable Mr. Justice A. Gans	November 20, 2013	November 19, 2015
Mr. J. Hodgson	December 17, 2013	December 16, 2015
The Honourable R. Kealey *	January 9, 2013	January 8, 2018
Mr. F. McArdle	December 17, 2013	December 16, 2015
Ms J. Mills	December 17, 2013	December 16, 2015
Mr. L. Morphy	December 17, 2013	December 16, 2015
Mr. D. Murphy *	April 2, 2008	April 1, 2014
Mr. R. Richardson	December 4, 2013	December 3, 2015
Mr. M. Segal *	January 9, 2013	January 8, 2018
Ms J. Trehearne	December 4, 2013	December 3, 2015
Mr. J. Weppler	November 3, 2010	November 2, 2015
Psychiatrists		
Dr. A.G. Ahmed	August 25, 2004	August 24, 2017
Dr. R.M. Andreychuk	March 21, 2007	March 20, 2017
Dr. G. Azadian *	September 3, 2008	September 2, 2018
Dr. M.H. Ben-Aron	October 4, 2000	December 13, 2016
Dr. B. Bordoff	July 31, 2001	July 30, 2017
Dr. D. Bourget	May 28, 1997	May 27, 2014
Dr. D.H. Braden	June 20, 2007	June 19, 2016
Dr. J.M.W. Bradford	February 1, 1984	February 28, 2017
Dr. R. Buckingham	June 12, 1992	February 28, 2017
Dr. D.S. Byers	March 1, 1983	February 28, 2017
Dr. L.E. Cappe	August 24, 1998	August 23, 2017
Dr. G.A. Chaimowitz	December 4, 1996	December 3, 2017
Dr. R. D. Chandrasena	December 6, 2000	February 3, 2017
Dr. S. Chatterjee	July 19, 2007	July 18, 2016
Dr. S. Cohen	April 10, 2013	April 9, 2015
Dr. P.E. Cook *	May 29, 2002	December 21, 2018
Dr. A. Côté	November 30, 1989	February 28, 2017
Dr. I. Côté	June 13, 2001	June 12, 2017
Dr. S.A. Darani	September 15, 2010	September 14, 2015
Dr. P.L. Darby	June 12, 1992	February 28, 2017

* Under O. Reg 88/11 of the *Adjudicative Tribunal Accountability, Governance and Appointments Act*, members were reappointed using an Automatic Waiver Form.

Member	Date First Appointed	Date Current Term Expires
Dr. K.D. DeFreitas	January 13, 2005	January 12, 2018
Dr. J. Ellis	October 21, 1998	November 20, 2017
Dr. L. Faucher	February 27, 2008	February 26, 2018
Dr. J. P. Fedoroff	October 17, 2001	November 6, 2017
Dr. J.C. Ferencz	December 4, 1996	November 27, 2017
Dr. F.W. Furlong	October 4, 2000	October 3, 2014
Dr. D.A. Galbraith	November 3, 1994	February 3, 2017
Dr. G. D. Glancy	March 1, 1988	February 28, 2017
Dr. K. Hand	November 3, 2010	November 2, 2015
Dr. R.W. Hill	December 15, 2004	December 14, 2016
Dr. S.J. Hucker	December 11, 1996	February 1, 2018
Dr. I. Jacques	April 28, 2010	April 27, 2015
Dr. W. Johnston *	April 2, 2008	April 1, 2018
Dr. A.D. Jones *	October 6, 1999	November 1, 2016
Dr. P.F. Kelly *	December 30, 1999	December 29, 2014
Dr. E. Kingstone	January 13, 1995	April 17, 2017
Dr. P.E. Klassen *	October 13, 1999	October 12, 2016
Dr. A. Kolodziej	August 21, 2003	October 4, 2017
Dr. W.J. Komer	February 5, 1997	May 2, 2014
Dr. R. Kunjukrishnan	December 4, 1996	December 3, 2017
Dr. S. Lessard	February 27, 2008	February 26, 2018
Dr. M. Marshall	June 27, 2007	June 26, 2016
Dr. A. McDonald	August 24, 1998	August 23, 2017
Dr. P. D. Norris *	October 9, 2002	January 17, 2016
Dr. D. Pallandi *	March 1, 2006	February 29, 2016
Dr. M.V.A. Prakash	August 24, 1998	August 28, 2017
Dr. P. J. Prendergast	June 12, 1992	February 28, 2017
Dr. L. Ramshaw	December 9, 2009	December 8, 2014
Dr. J. Rootenberg	June 22, 2006	June 21, 2014
Dr. A. Seif	June 27, 2007	June 26, 2016
Dr. R.R.B. Sheppard	December 11, 1996	December 10, 2017
Dr. G.S. Sidhu *	December 7, 1994	May 31, 2016
Dr. W.R. Surphlis *	March 30, 1999	April 19, 2018
Dr. S. Swaminath *	December 8, 1993	April 19, 2018
Dr. T. Verny *	January 9, 2013	January 8, 2018
Dr. Z. Waisman	January 15, 2007	January 14, 2017
Dr. T. Wilkie	April 22, 2009	April 21, 2014
Dr. S. Woodside	May 4, 2011	May 3, 2016
Psychologists		
Dr. R.B. Cormier	December 2, 1998	December 1, 2017
Dr. P. Firestone *	October 9, 2002	October 17, 2016
Dr. J. Freedman	October 22, 2009	October 21, 2014
Dr. G. B. Jones *	March 31, 2000	March 30, 2014
Dr. C. Lee	August 12, 2009	August 11, 2014
Dr. L.O. Lightfoot	November 20, 1992	February 3, 2017
Dr. L.C. Litman	February 25, 1998	February 24, 2017

* Under O. Reg 88/11 of the *Adjudicative Tribunal Accountability, Governance and Appointments Act*, members were reappointed using an Automatic Waiver Form.

Member	Date First Appointed	Date Current Term Expires
Dr. W. Loza	July 5, 2007	July 4, 2016
Dr. M. Mamak	January 27, 2005	January 26, 2018
Dr. G. Nexhipi *	March 20, 2002	April 19, 2018
Dr. D. Nussbaum	December 3, 1997	March 23, 2017
Dr. N. Pollock	November 3, 1994	February 3, 2017
Dr. D.J. Simourd	December 1, 2004	November 20, 2017
Dr. G.M. Turrall	February 24, 1993	February 28, 2017
Dr. C.D. Webster	December 13, 2000	March 23, 2017
Dr. S.E. Wiseman	August 25, 2004	August 24, 2017
Dr. P.N. Wright	August 24, 1998	August 23, 2017
Public Members		
Mr. S. Auty	September 29, 2010	September 28, 2015
Ms. N. Boivin *	March 11, 2009	March 10, 2019
Mr. J. Cyr *	January 9, 2013	January 8, 2018
Ms. M. M. Dow	February 6, 2002	February 5, 2016
Mr. T. Elek	May 16, 2007	May 15, 2017
Mr. W. Gee	January 31, 2008	January 30, 2018
Rev. W. A. Jupp	May 2, 2007	May 1, 2017
Ms. N. Lemieux-McKinnon *	July 15, 2005	July 14, 2016
Ms. M. Linton*	October 5, 2005	October 4, 2016
Ms. C.E. Little*	December 7, 2005	December 6, 2016
Dr. L.L.Q. Lum	November 19, 1997	March 31, 2016
Mr. Y. Mahdavi *	July 15, 2005	July 14, 2016
Ms. R. MacIntyre	January 13, 2005	January 12, 2016
Ms. K.A. Maharaj	March 21, 2007	March 20, 2017
Ms. C. McGrath *	March 25, 2009	March 24, 2019
Ms. L. Montgomery	April 8, 2009	April 7, 2014
Ms. B. Murray	October 20, 2010	October 19, 2015
Ms. B. Naegele *	January 9, 2013	January 8, 2018
Mr. A. Okon *	April 20, 2005	April 19, 2016
Ms. D.M. Ormston *	May 17, 1999	February 2, 2016
Mr. P. Poirier	June 28, 2007	June 27, 2016
Ms. J.J. Roy	December 16, 1998	March 19, 2016
Mr. P. Schur	May 30, 2006	May 29, 2014
Ms. L. Steadman	December 21, 2004	December 20, 2014
Mr. K. Turner	January 15, 2007	January 14, 2017
Dr. D.M. Winkler	May 12, 2004	May 11, 2017

* Under O. Reg 88/11 of the *Adjudicative Tribunal Accountability, Governance and Appointments Act*, members were reappointed using an Automatic Waiver Form.

Review Board Personnel

Up to March 31, 2014

Name	Position
The Honourable Mr. Justice Richard D. Schneider	Chair
Joe Wright	Legal Counsel
Angie Baggetta	Registrar and Senior Manager
Amanda Wallace	Executive Assistant
Sheila McDermott	Deputy Registrar
Manny Tan	Board Order Administrator
Sewranie Narine	Board Order Administrator
Amsale Mamo	Board Order Administrator
Radica Roopsingh	Case Coordinator
Puja Karia	Case Coordinator
Carolyn Cook	Case Coordinator
Rhea Duketovsky	Case Coordinator
Chloe Vice	Distribution Coordinator
Antonia Virzi	Distribution and Records Clerk
Olga Lenskaia	Coordinator, Business Operations
Alisha McKendrick	Administrative and Financial Assistant
Sophie Goldenberg	Bilingual Receptionist/Secretary
Fran Bolton	Secretary to Chair/Counsel
John Smith	Systems Officer

2013-2014 Expenditures by Standard Account

Description	Printed Estimates	Expenditures	Surplus/ (Deficit)
Salaries and Wages	855, 100	1, 287, 961	- 432, 861
Benefits	99, 100	170, 869	- 71, 769
Transportation & Communications	527, 800	768, 397	- 240, 596
Services	5, 836, 800	4, 591, 061	1, 245, 739
Supplies and Equipment	56, 600	46, 881	9, 718
Total	7, 375, 400	6, 865, 169	510, 321

Expenditures by Function

Function	Expenditures
Salaries & Wages	1, 287, 961
Employee Benefits	170, 869
Administration & Hearing Support	224, 392
Annual Hearings	3, 403, 055
Initial Hearings	1, 147, 821
Education	214, 450
Adjudicative Operations	210, 984
Information Systems	67, 509
ORB Accommodation	138, 128
Total	6, 865, 169

Other Direct Operating Expenses
(not including salaries, wages and accommodation)